

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, and 15 remain withdrawn.

Amendment

Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 have been amended to further improve their form and clarity. Specifically, independent claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended to positively define that the resource data is used for a print job. See at least paragraph 43 and Fig. 3 of corresponding USPGP 2004/0184076. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ikeno (USP 7,154,617) in view of Holmstead (USPGP 2004/0024844).

In the previous reply, applicant explained why Holmstead would not have taught preventing downloading of resources when a print job currently exists in a storage device. In response, the examiner merely repeats that Holmstead's paragraphs 47, 51, 53, and Fig. 4 disclose the claimed downloading-preventing feature. In this vein, the examiner alleges that downloading is not necessary when a print job already exists in the storage of the printing device.

Applicant submits that downloading refers to the downloading of the resource data (e.g., fonts) rather than a print job itself. In this respect, the examiner's argument is misplaced.

Independent claims 1, 6 and 11 call for the following features:

- (1) storing in a storage unit at least one of print jobs transmitted from at least one of a plurality of information processing apparatuses and resource data used for a print job;
- (2) determining whether a print job exists in the storage unit when a download start request for the resource data has been received from one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses; and
- (3) when the print job exists in the storage unit, informing the one information processing apparatus from which the download start request for resource data is received that downloading of the resource data is not possible.

The above configuration enables the user, who has operated one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses to transmit the download start request for the resource data used for the print job, to be notified that downloading of the resource data is not possible when the print job exists in the storage unit.

Ikeno discloses that if data sent to a resource port 3411 is determined to be data that aims at downloading of resources, an acceptance stop instruction of a print job is issued. If any print job remains in a print queue buffer 3415, the resource data sent to the resource port 3411 is prevented from being stored in an appropriate storage area 3419. In Ikeno, the resource data is stored in the appropriate storage area 3419 only when no print job is present in the print queue buffer 3415 to thereby update the resource data. See column 16, lines 15-27.

In other words, while Ikeno discloses determining whether the print job exists in the print queue buffer 3415 in response to reception of the data sent to the resource port, Ikeno, however, does not disclose or teach (a) the resource port 3411 receiving a download start request for resource data, and (b) notifying the client PC, from which the data sent to the resource port has been received, that downloading of data is not possible when a print job exists in the print queue buffer 3415. That is, Ikeno fails to disclose or teach claimed features (2) and (3) identified above.

Holmstead discloses searching a particular directory A-D into which a local memory 302 is segmented each time a print job ticket 500 is received, to determine if a print job element 504 referenced by the ticket already exists in the local memory 302. See paragraph 47. Print job elements 504, however, are components of a document, such as photos, text, images, or some other item of page data (see paragraph 37), used for processing a print job. In other words, the print job elements 504 do not correspond to a print job, but rather to data used for a print job. Holmstead at best merely teaches determining whether resource data used for a print job exists in a storage unit. But Holmstead fails to disclose or teach determining whether a print job, using the print job element 504 for processing the print job, exists in the local memory 302 when a download start request for resource data has been received.

For the foregoing reasons, even if the combination urged by the examiner is deemed proper for argument's sake, Holmstead would not have cured Ikeno's shortcomings noted above.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

29 SEPTEMBER 2009

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS, REG. NO. 34,079

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150  
ASHBURN, VA 20147  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)